



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

AS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,605	03/20/2001	Shunji Baba	1614.1142	9323

21171 7590 04/15/2002

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
700 11TH STREET, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

TALBOT, BRIAN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2002

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/811,605	BABA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian K Talbot	1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1762

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-3,6 and 7 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. Claims 4,5,8-12 have been canceled. Claims 1-3,6 and 7 remain in the application.

Specification

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

No apparatus claim remain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claim recites a step of "stretching the resin atop a stage". This step is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not mention "stretching". Clarification is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by JP 6-120,276.

JP 6-120,276 teaches applying a resin from a syringe to a circuit board whereby the coating applied is “imaged” after application to the circuit board but prior to drying. The “imaging” step then controls the dispenser based on the results of the measurement.

With respect to claim 2, the claim recites “stretching atop a stage”. As there is no in depth discussion as to what the step of “stretching” is, the Examiner has taken the position that the dispensed resin has been “stretched” over the circuit board.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1762

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 6-120,276.

JP 6-120,276 fails to teach the “measuring” device being of a fluorescent type.

It is the Examiner’s position that the use of fluorescence is commonplace in the art of “measuring/monitoring” a coating and hence, it would have been within the skill of one practicing in the art to have utilized any well know measuring/monitoring technique such as fluorescence to obtain the desired results.

Claim 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 6-120,276 in combination with Nakasu et al. (6,213,356 B1).

JP 6-120,276 fails to teaching measuring/monitoring the drop prior to contact with the substrate.

Nakasus et al. (6,213,356 B1) depicts monitoring a dispensed droplet of coating material by a sensor (25) prior to contacting the substrate or monitoring the residual material on the nozzle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified JP 6-120,276 process by incorporating a measuring/monitoring device to measure the droplet prior to contact with the substrate as evidenced by Nakasu et al. (6,213,356 B1) with the expectation of achieving similar results, i.e. a more controlled deposition of the coating material.

With respect to changing the distance of the nozzle from the substrate or to monitoring the nozzle’s tip, it is the Examiner’s position that these differences are conventional in the art as well as being commonplace. The distance from the substrate is arbitrary and effects the spread

Art Unit: 1762

of coating material. The art teaches monitoring both the droplet and the coating material dispensed and it is the Examiner's position that one skilled in the art would have been suggested that monitoring the nozzle tip could be done to avoid clogging or unnecessary deposition.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 6AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-6078 for regular communications and (703) 872-9765 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775.



Brian K Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT
April 11, 2002